

REMARKS

Claim Rejections

Claims 2-3 and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 as indefinite.

Claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Hand et al. (US2004/0238319).

Specification Amendments

The specification has been amended to correct errors of a clerical or typographical nature.

Claim Amendments

Claim 2 has been amended to eliminate the indefiniteness rejection of claims 2-3 and 6.

The Cited Art

Hand et al. is directed to a bezel for use with a bill acceptor. As shown in FIG. 4, the communications system of Hand et al. includes a bill acceptor 12, a PDA 100, and either an IrDA interface board 90 or a bezel processor/IrDA board 92. The board 92 includes a processor, while the board 90 does not. The board 90 or 92 communicates passively between an interface board 80 of the bill acceptor and a corresponding IrDA transceiver 38. The IrDA transceiver communicates via an infrared data communication link with the PDA.

The IrDA interface board, whether with a processor or not, controls all communications between the PDA and the bill acceptor 12. That is, the bill acceptor cannot communicate with the PDA without one of the boards 90 or 92, as the boards act as an interface or connection between the PDA and the bill acceptor.

Claims 1-20 Would Not Have Been Obvious

Three criteria must be met to establish obviousness. First, the prior art must provide one of ordinary skill in the art with a suggestion or motivation to modify or combine the teachings of the references relied upon in rejecting the claims. Second, the prior art must provide one of ordinary skill in the art with a reasonable expectation of success. Third, the prior art, either alone or in combination, must teach or suggest each and every limitation of the rejected claims. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed invention, as well as the reasonable expectation of success, must come from the prior art and not from Applicants' disclosure. If any one of these criteria is not met, a case of obviousness is not established.

The gaming components of the Hand et al. communication system are not connected by a hostless communication link which allows each controller of a gaming component to communicate with each of the other controllers of other gaming components on a peer-to-peer basis without a master controller.

Instead, the board 90 or 92 acts as a master controller, as one of the boards 90 or 92 manages all communications between the PDA and the bill acceptor. That is, depending on the embodiment, either the board 90 or 92 controls all the communications to and from the bill acceptor.

Thus, Hand et al. does not teach or suggest each and every limitation of Applicants' claimed invention. As such, Applicants' claimed invention would not have been obvious in view of Hand et al.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all the claims are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, allowance of the claims at the earliest possible date is requested.

If prosecution of this application can be assisted by telephone, the Examiner is requested to call Applicants' undersigned attorney at (510) 663-1100.

If any fees are due in connection with the filing of this amendment (including any fees due for an extension of time), such fees may be charged to Deposit Account No. 500388 (Order No. IGT1P318).

Dated: June 24, 2006

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP

Reginald J. Suyat
Reginald J. Suyat
Reg. No. 28,172

P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250